

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending but stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 have been amended to clarify that the recited media stack has opposing faces joined by sides where each face is a face of a media sheet. The amendments find support in paragraph 16 of the specification and in Figure 1. In light of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and pass the application on to issuance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 as being anticipated by JP 05-294483A to Morita.

Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus that includes the following:

1. a tray for holding a media stack, the media stack having opposing faces joined by sides, each face being a face of a media sheet;
2. a sensor; and
3. a transport mechanism to move the tray past the sensor to scan at least one of the sides of the media stack.

Rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner noted that Morita's Figure 1 shows a sensor in the form of a photo coupler (PC) positioned above a face of a media sheet topping a stack of media sheets. See Morita paragraph [0031]. The Examiner interpreted Claim 1 such that the face of the top sheet of Morita's media stack constituted a side of that media stack. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the recited media stack has opposing faces joined by sides where each face is a face of a media sheet. As such the sides of a media stack are different than the faces of the media stack.

Because Morita's sensor (PC) is positioned above a face of a media stack, Morita's transport mechanism is not operable to move a tray past the sensor to scan at least one of the sides of the media stack in other words, Morita's sensor (PC) cannot scan a side of a media stack. It can only scan a face of a media stack. Consequently,

Morita fails to teach a transport mechanism to move the tray past the sensor to scan at least one of the sides of the media stack.

For at least this reason Claim 1 and Claim 2 which depends from Claim 1 are patentable over Morita.

Claim 3 is directed to a media source that includes the following:

1. a tray for holding a media stack, the media stack having opposing faces joined by sides, each face being a face of a media sheet;
2. a transport mechanism operable to move the tray between a first position in which the media stack can be loaded onto the tray and a second position in which a sheet from the media stack loaded onto the tray can be fed into a print path of an imaging device; and
3. a sensor positioned so that it can scan at least one of the sides of the media stack as the transport mechanism moves the tray between the first and second positions.

As with Claim 1, Morita's sensor (PC) is not positioned so that it can scan at least one of the sides of the media stack. Consequently Morita fails to teach or suggest a sensor positioned so that it can scan at least one of the sides of the media stack as the transport mechanism moves the tray between the first and second positions. For at least this reason Claim 3 and Claims 4 and 5 which depend from Claim 3 are patentable over Morita.

Claim 6 is directed to a media source that includes the following:

1. a tray for holding a media stack, the media stack having opposing faces joined by sides, each face being a face of a media sheet;;

2. means for moving the tray between a first position and a second position;
and
3. means for scanning at least one of the sides of the media stack with the tray between the first position and the second position.

As with Claim 1, Morita's sensor (PC) is not positioned so that it can scan at least one of the sides of the media stack. Consequently Morita does not teach or suggest means for scanning at least one of the sides of the media stack with the tray between the first position and the second position. For at least this reason Claim 6 and Claims 7 and 8 which depend from Claim 6 are patentable over Morita.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claims 9-25 and 28-49 as being anticipated by USPN 5,992,324 issued to Rombult.

Claim 9 is directed to a data identification system and recites the following:

1. a tray for holding a media stack, the media stack having a side with a pattern to encode information related to data;
2. a transport mechanism operable to move the tray between a first position and a second position;
3. a sensor positioned to scan the pattern as the transport mechanism moves the tray between the first position and the second position; and
4. logic coupled to the sensor and operable to decipher the pattern to identify the data.

Rombult discusses system capable of printing lithographic plates. See Rombult, Title and Abstract. Referring to Rombult's Figures 2 and 7, that system includes a series of moveable tables (34 and 36). Placed on each table (34 and 36) is a cassette (24). Each cassette (24) contains a stack of plates (26). Rombult, col. 4, lines 1-5.

Each cassette (24) includes a tag (187) on an outside surface that identifies the plates (16) contained in that cassette (24). See Rombult, col. 4, lines 27-30 and reference number 187 shown in Fig. 7.

The Examiner mistakenly equates Rombult's cassette (24) with the media stack recited in Claim 9. Rombult's cassettes (24) each hold stacks of plates (26). In other words, each of Rombult's cassettes (24) holds a media stack in the form of plates (26). In the context of Claim 9, Rombult's cassettes (24) are at best trays for holding media stacks. There is NO pattern on the side of Rombult's stacks of plates (26). Rombult's scanning device (61) is positioned to scan outer surfaces of cassettes (24). So, even if Rombult's stacks of plates (26) included patterns, that scanning device (61) is not positioned to scan the plates (26) contained within the cassettes (24).

Consequently, Rombult fails to teach or suggest a media stack having a side with a pattern to encode information related to data or a sensor positioned to scan that pattern as the transport mechanism moves the tray between the first position and the second position. For at least this reason, Claim 9 and Claims 10-18 which depend from Claim 9 are patentable over Rombult.

Claim 19 is directed to an imaging device and recites the following:

1. a print engine operable to form an image on a sheet of media;
2. a media source operable to supply a media stack, the media source including:
 - a. a tray for holding the media stack, the media stack having a side with a pattern encoding information corresponding to imaging data;
 - b. a transport mechanism operable to move the tray between a first position and a second position;
 - c. a sensor positioned to scan the pattern as the transport mechanism moves the tray between the first position and the second position;
3. a transfer mechanism operable to transfer sheets of media from the media source to the print engine;

4. control logic in communication with the media source, the print engine, and the transfer mechanism, the control logic operable to identify the imaging data and to control the operation of transfer mechanism the operation of the print engine according to the imaging data.

As with Claim 9, the Examiner mistakenly equates Rombult's cassette (24) with the media stack recited in Claim 19. Rombult's cassettes (24) each hold stacks of plates (26). In other words, each of Rombult's cassettes (24) holds a media stack in the form of plates (26). In the context of Claim 19, Rombult's cassettes (24) are at best trays for holding media stacks. There is NO pattern on the side of Rombult's stacks of plates (26). Rombult's scanning device (61) is positioned to scan outer surfaces of cassettes (24). So, even if Rombult's stacks of plates (26) included patterns, that scanning device (61) is not positioned to scan the plates (26) contained within the cassettes (24).

Consequently, Rombult fails to teach or suggest a media stack having a side with a pattern encoding information corresponding to imaging data or a sensor positioned to scan that pattern as the transport mechanism moves the tray between the first position and the second position. For at least this reason, Claim 19 and Claims 20-25 which depend from Claim 19 are patentable over Rombult.

Claim 28 is directed to a method and recites the following:

1. providing a tray for holding a media stack having a side with a pattern, the tray being moveable between a first position and a second position ;
2. moving the tray between the first position and the second position;
3. scanning the pattern as the tray is moved between the first position and the second position; and
4. deciphering the pattern to identify data corresponding to the pattern.

As with Claim 9, the Examiner mistakenly equates Rombult's cassette (24) with the media stack recited in Claim 28. Rombult's cassettes (24) each hold stacks of plates (26). In other words, each of Rombult's cassettes (24) holds a media stack in the form of plates (26). In the context of Claim 19, Rombult's cassettes (24) are at best trays for holding media stacks. There is NO pattern on the side of Rombult's stacks of plates (26). Rombult's scanning device (61) is positioned to scan outer surfaces of cassettes (24). So, even if Rombult's stacks of plates (26) included patterns, that scanning device (61) is not positioned to scan the plates (26) contained within the cassettes (24).

Consequently, Rombult fails to teach or suggest a media stack having a side with a pattern or scanning such a pattern as the tray is moved between the first position and the second position. For at least this reason, Claim 28 and Claims 29-39 which depend from Claim 28 are patentable over Rombult.

Claim 40 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 28. for at least the same reasons Claim 28 is patentable over Rombult, so are Claim 40 and Claims 41-49 which depend from Claim 40

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claims 26 and 27 and being unpatentable over Morita in view of Rombult.

Claim 26 is directed to an imaging device and recites the following:

1. a print engine operable to form an image on a sheet of media;
2. a first media source operable to supply a first media stack, the first media source including:
 - a. a first tray for holding the first media stack, the first media stack having a side with a first pattern encoding information

- corresponding to first imaging data;
 - b. a first transport mechanism operable to move the first tray between a first position and a second position;
 - c. a first sensor positioned to scan the first pattern as the first transport mechanism moves the first tray between the first position and the second position;
- 3. a second media source operable to supply a second media stack, the second media source including:
 - a. a second tray for holding the second media stack, the second media stack having a side with a second pattern encoding information corresponding to second imaging data;
 - b. a second transport mechanism operable to move the second tray between a first position and a second position;
 - c. a second sensor positioned to scan the second pattern as the second transport mechanism moves the second tray between the first position and the second positions;
- 4. a transfer mechanism operable to transfer sheets of media from the first and second media sources to the print engine;
- 5. control logic in communication with the first and second media sources, the print engine, and the transfer mechanism, the control logic operable to decipher the first and second patterns to identify the first and second imaging data and to control the operation of the transfer mechanism and to control the operation of the print engine so that the first imaging data is used when a media sheet is transferred from the first media source and the second imaging data is used when a media sheet is transferred from the second media source.

The Examiner admits that Morita fails to teach media stacks having sides patterns encoding information. Addressing Morita's deficiency, the Examiner relies on Rombult. As with Claim 9, the Examiner mistakenly equates Rombult's cassettes (24)

with the first and second media stacks recited in Claim 26. Rombult's cassettes (24) hold stacks of plates (26). In other words, each of Rombult's cassettes (24) holds a media stack in the form of plates (26). In the context of Claim 26, Rombult's cassettes (24) are at best first and second trays for holding first and second media stacks. There is NO pattern on the side of Rombult's stacks of plates (26). Rombult's scanning device (61) is positioned to scan outer surfaces of cassettes (24). So, even if Rombult's stacks of plates (26) included patterns, that scanning device (61) is not positioned to scan the plates (26) contained within the cassettes (24).

Consequently, Rombult fails to teach or suggest first and second media stacks each having a side with a pattern or scanning such patterns as the respective trays holding the first and second media stacks are moved between the first position and the second position. For at least this reason, Claim 26 and Claim 27 which depends from Claim 26 are patentable over Morita and Rombult.

Conclusion: In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
David C. Gast

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

April 3, 2007